India

FOR THE

No. 298. New Series.] No. 302. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. { Price...... 3d. By Post, 3½d.

Notes and News 301
The Seventeenth National Congress 304
Our London Letter 305
Chronicle of the Week 306
Letter to the Editor:
"Mr. Hyndman's Indictment" ... 307
Sir Richard Garth on the Indian National Congress 307
British Indians in South Africa:
The "Natal Witness" on "Human Shoddy" 308
Lord G. Hamilton and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman: A Specimen of Controversial Method 310
The Passing of the Imperial Institute 311
"The Poverty of India" 311
Advertisements 312

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The prepaid subscription to "INDIA" (post free) is as follows:—

	s.	d.
IN THE UNITED KINGDOM:—		
For Twelve Months	10	6
,, Six ,, ...	6	0
,, Three ,, ...	3	6
IN INDIA:—	Rs.	As.
For Twelve Months	8	0
,, Six ,, ...	4	8
,, Three ,, ...	2	8

The price of a single copy is 3d., or post free 3½d.

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE President of the Indian National Congress which met yesterday in Calcutta for its Seventeenth Session is Mr. Dinshaw Edulji Wacha, of Bombay, who is already chairman of the Municipal Corporation of that City. A managing agent of a large cotton mill, and a member of the Bombay Millowners' Association, Mr. Wacha has long been an authority on all questions connected with that industry. He is even more widely known for the active part which he has taken in public movements. He was appointed by the Bombay Presidency Association to give evidence in England before the Indian Expenditure Commission. He appeared before the Commission in 1897, and in answer to a question put by the Chairman, he described himself as one of the honorary secretaries of the Bombay Presidency Association since its establishment in 1885, honorary joint general secretary of the Indian National Congress, honorary secretary of the Bombay Provincial Conference, and honorary secretary of the Bombay Branch of the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association. He has, besides, been a frequent contributor to the Bombay Press, treating such subjects as the finances of the State and the Municipality, the drink traffic, and agricultural distress. But long as is the record of his tireless activity, he is even more to be respected for his firmness, which has ever remained unshaken by political adversity, for his disinterestedness, and his inexhaustible public spirit.

A survey of the Indian and Anglo-Indian journals which have arrived by recent mails gives some idea of the interest and activity excited in various parts of India by the approach of the Congress Session. The Session was announced to open yesterday (Thursday) in an enormous pandal specially constructed for the reception of the delegates in Beadon Square, Calcutta. A conspicuous feature of this year's Congress is likely to be found in the attention paid to industries. The meeting of the Congress will, we understand, synchronise with a great Industrial Exhibition in Calcutta. A Calcutta contemporary says that

> Arrangements are also being made for lighting up the whole Beadon garden by electricity. Many gentlemen of high position have voluntarily offered medals for the encouragement of indigenous industries. The Exhibition Committee are anxious that manufacturers from different parts of India should avail themselves of this opportunity to exhibit their articles and their artistic skill, and thus receive suitable recognition of their merit.

Meantime the Secretary of the Reception Committee had some weeks ago addressed to the Standing Congress Committees throughout India a circular regarding the election and the requirements of delegates. Englishmen who derive their notions of representative political assemblies from the Conferences which are from time to time held in this country can have no idea of the self-sacrifice that is required of the delegates elected to attend the Indian National Congress. For them it is no political pic-nic with travelling expenses and hotel accommodation provided from central funds. Every delegate has not only to pay his travelling expenses—and for the vast distances which many delegates travel in India these are often no light amount—but before taking his seat he has also to pay a fee of ten rupees towards the general expenses of the Session.

Some conception of the difficulties of organisation may be formed from the following passage in the circular to which we have referred:—

> I shall feel much obliged by your supplying me with the following detailed information by or before the first week of December next:—
>
> 1. The total number of Delegates that will come to Calcutta for the next Congress from your Circle.
> 2. How many of them are Mahometans?
> 3. Of the Mahometans how many will live European fashion?
> 4. How many Hindus will live European fashion?
> 5. Besides the Hindus and Mahometans, how many delegates of what other caste or communities, such as Parsis, Jews, Europeans, Eurasians, etc., will live European fashion?
> 6. Of the Hindus who will live Indian fashion, how many will require separate cooking places for cooking food by their own cooks?
> 7. How many Hindus will take food cooked by Bengalee Brahmins?
> 8. How many Hindus will not take any food that is not cooked by Brahmins of their own Province or by their own caste-people, and will not at the same time have such cooks with them?
>
> I beg also to remind you that all Delegates are to take with them their own pillows and bedding and mosquito curtains. Also one or two "lotas or batlos a thala," and any small vessels that they habitually use; the large vessels for water and cooking, and plenty of ulantain leaves, etc., will be provided by the Reception Committee.
>
> Should it be found desirable to bring Brahmin cooks from your place to Calcutta for cooking the food of the Hindu Delegates of your Circle kindly inform me soon whether you would be able to engage and send such cooks here, and what would be the cost of each such cook, including his wages, travelling charges, and every other expense?

It is well that the public at home should know something of the patient labour involved every year in the arrangement of the meetings which yield so much valuable counsel for the Government and attract so many sneers from the Government's toadies in the Press.

From the same circular we learn that the officers of this year's Reception Committee are as follows:—

Chairman: Maharaja of Natore.

Secretaries: Babus Bhupendra Nath Bose, Jadu Nath Sen, Ambica Charan Mozumdar, The Honorable Babu Baikanta Nath Sen, Mr. J. Choudhury, Mr. K. B. Dutt, and Mr. J. Ghosal.

Treasurer: Babu Nolin Behari Sarkar.

Assistant Secretary: Babu Prithwis Chunder Ray.

Canon MacColl remonstrates with a correspondent of the "Spectator" who based an argument on the "master-fallacy that Russia desires to possess India." Canon MacColl says:—

> Let him purge his mind of that prejudice and look at the question in the dry light of facts, and he will, I think, be forced to the conclusion that Russia would not accept India as a free gift. India is a poor country, and is becoming poorer; and the rapid growth of its population suggests an alarming problem for British statesmanship. Sir James Mackintosh—no mean authority—after studying the question of India on the spot, "contended that it was not of any great value" to us. That shrewd observer of men and things, Charles Greville, expressed his fear in 1859 of "seeing England placed in danger by her exertions to retain or reconquer

India, whose value is so problematical, and of which nothing is certain but the immense labour and cost of her retention." We are there, however, and have come under a moral obligation to the people of India to maintain our rule even at the risk of great danger and material loss. But Russia is under no obligation. Why should she voluntarily incur such risk and danger? I believe her conquest of India against us to be a sheer impossibility.

This is a curious mixture of the thing that is and the thing that is not.

That India is poor and becoming poorer, that Russia has shown no desire to possess India, and that her "conquest of India against us" is a sheer impossibility—all this is true enough. But on what grounds does Canon MacColl maintain that the "rapid growth" of population in India suggests an "alarming problem," and that our possession of India is a source of "material loss" to us? Population in India does not grow rapidly. On the contrary, as the last census showed, it has for the past ten years been practically stationary. As for "material loss" the "Spectator" may well add as a foot-note to Canon MacColl's letter: "With his encouragement of the idea that India is a useless burden we are in entire disagreement." The material loss is India's not ours—at any rate, there are certain classes in this country who have derived and are deriving great material gains from British rule in India. On the other hand, it is undoubtedly true, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has always insisted, that if India were governed in accordance with the pledges of British statesmen she would be in a position to yield incalculably greater benefits to the people of the United Kingdom as a whole. The present system is doubly bad. It impoverishes India, and, while it brings an unmerited profit to a small section of the British public, it prevents the widespread advantages which depend for their realisation upon a condition of prosperity in India itself.

The "Times of India" subjects the Bombay Government to severe criticism for their conduct in relation to the Gujerat Revenue enquiry, and not least for the Resolution on Mr. Maconochie's report. In their Resolution the Government "thank their nominee eloquently" and then virtually put aside many of his findings. The Resolution says: "The net result of the enquiry is to show that the bulk of the specific charges . . . . have not been established by the evidence, and that other accusations made against the revenue officers as a body are at the least gross exaggerations." In the light of Mr. Maconochie's conclusions, our contemporary declares that this "estimate of the net result of the enquiry is neither accurate nor entirely frank." The "Times of India" goes on: "If you appoint an officer to find out the truth; if you then permit his findings to be criticised by other officers who are directly concerned, but were not present at the enquiry; if finally, you reject some of the findings and belittle others you may get any "net result" you wish.

To come to the points in which the Government have passed over or minimised Mr. Maconochie's findings. He brought a charge against the Mamlatdar of Olpad of fabricating false evidence. The Government has absolved the Mamlatdar. Mr. Maconochie believed that in at least two villages, the Karkun Chhaganlal had thrashed people, while complaints of the same treatment from many other villages "cannot be altogether explained away." The Government admit that "in at least one instance" his conduct towards the people was "intemperate," a very mild epithet to apply to the beating of rayats. Mr. Maconochie held that Olpad Bai Mani was made to hand over her ornaments, that at Kedrama, attachments were irregularly made, and that the talati of Umracchi sealed up houses. The Government in each case come to the opposite conclusion. It is something, however, to have the Government's admission that "a hard atmosphere" prevailed in the collection of revenue in at least one district in a very bad year, and that revenue was recovered from taccavi advances, even though the admission is limited to a few cases, while Mr. Maconochie found that this practice was "universal" in Ankleshwar.

There is another point on which the "Times of India" finds fault with the Government of Bombay. According to the Government's own showing "Mr. Parekh rendered the Government as well as the rayats of Gujerat a considerable service," yet instead of thanking him, the Resolution talks of "gross exaggerations." Indians are often accused of a want of public spirit. Here is a man who has given time and labour without hope of reward to the particularly thankless task of exposing the wrongs done to a defenceless peasantry. His treatment will hardly encourage others to go and do likewise.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated December 21:—

Prospects unaltered, cold weather rains not having commenced. Distress is not rapidly developing. Prices moderate in affected districts; highest in Rajputana. The numbers demanding relief have continued to increase slowly in Gujerat, where, however, dearest price is reported to be 17 seers per rupee. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 53,000; Bombay Native States, 21,000; Baroda, 30,000; Mysore, 2,000; Rajputana States, 1,000. Total, 107,000.

The British Press is showing a good deal of interest in the revived proposal to establish agricultural banks in India. The "Liverpool Courier," a few days ago, in an article which contained a good deal of sound sense mixed up with some fallacy, wrote:—

The Eastern ruler took more than his share in a good year, but he was content to go with less in a bad year, and, although on the whole he took more, his elastic methods made his heavier exactions easier for the cultivator. We are satisfied that on the average we take less than our predecessor, but our ways are harder to bear. In theory a good year should be set over against a bad, and it is to be hoped that the co-operative credit societies will enable the cultivator to do so. The experiment of introducing co-operation in entirely new ground will be watched with interest.

The "Financial Times" has printed a careful review of the report of the Committee in relation to the recommendations of the Famine Commission. Its conclusion is as follows:—

Hence it is with the greater satisfaction that all who are concerned as to the virtual serfdom to the sowcar of the cultivating classes in India will note that both reports speak hopefully of the practical possibilities of the co-operative credit system as a means of deliverance. The Committee is convinced that "the experiment is worthy of every encouragement and of a prolonged trial." The Commissioners recognise that the movement will be confronted with the opposition of the moneylender, and with suspicion and half-hearted support in other quarters. But in the movement "lies a large hope for the future of agriculture in India," and they believe that "if taken up and pressed with patience and energy, such associations may be successfully worked." The report points out that "Indian Native life presents us with instances of co-operation for mutual benefit, and the principle which underlies the 'Raiffeisen' system is not really foreign to the thoughts of the people."

And the "Observer" says: "On the whole it is most satisfactory to see that the Indian authorities have overcome their former repugnance to the idea of agricultural banks." Precisely. But how much precious time has been lost in the process!

Mr. Jesse Collings, M.P., has been touring in India and bringing his Brummagem eye to bear upon it and its people. Speaking at Calcutta, he is reported ("Times," December 19) to have said "that his eyes had been opened by the industrial work of India, and by the quality of the goods made in the country." It does not say much for his interest in our various Exhibitions here, or for the utility of the Imperial Institute, that he required to go to India to have his eyes opened in this dramatic fashion. What then does Mr. Jesse Collings at last see? He sees that the mineral resources are practically untouched: as if that fact were not patent in every economic Blue-book on India, and in every work that deals with the subject. Well, this strange sight prompts his nimble brain to a bright practical conclusion: namely, "that British capital and management with Native labour must make India a factor with which the British workman will have to reckon." Observe: "BRITISH capital and management," and "NATIVE labour." In other words—more exploitation. It reminds one of Blücher's reported exclamation on viewing London after Waterloo: "Mein Gott, was ein town to sack!" But the ideal is Brummagem to the core.

To agree with the "Outlook" is a pleasure which we do not often enjoy. But its remarks upon the telegram which reported that Lord Curzon had "peremptorily stopped till further orders" the mobilisation of a brigade for Waziristan are very much to the point:—

This is exactly what the British public wishes to hear, and no telegram from India could be more welcome than that above quoted. The military want to fight, and would be poor-spirited

soldiers if they felt otherwise, and the frontier officer (if Mr. Bruce may be accepted as a judge, and his opinion coincides with that generally held) wants to move forward, subjugate, and annex ad infinitum. But the Indian taxpayer does not want to pay, and the British taxpayer, overburdened with war taxation himself, sympathises with his suffering brother. Nor will the misery and starvation occasioned to women and children by these frontier expeditions remain much longer unnoticed by a generation which in South Africa feeds the women and children of its enemies; but up in the cold, bleak hills the women and children of the tribesmen, driven from their homes, are not fed, and no one counts their deaths and exclaims against the policy to which, sometimes at any rate, such deaths are due. The less notice taken of petty frontier fights, and the more public opinion supports the head of the Indian Administration in endeavouring to curb all the unruly spirits upon our side and upon the other, the better for the cause of humanity upon both sides of the border.

What a commentary upon the factitious nature of the operations which "K.C.B.-mania" has so often brought about!

A Bombay telegram published in the "Times" (December 21) announces a development of the Koweyt affair. The Sultan of Turkey is reported to have sent a special emissary to invite the Sheikh Mubarakh to proceed to Constantinople and do obeisance to his "suzerain," with honours in one hand and a menace of removal in the other. But the wary Sheikh has not allowed the emissary to land. Meantime he is threatened, at the instance of the Sultan, by another attack from his neighbour Ibn Rashid, the Sultan of Nejd. The Sheikh is said to want to abdicate in favour of his son, provided the British will take him under their protection. At the same time a Russian cruiser is astonishing the Natives with her four funnels and six searchlights, and Russian medical experts are inquiring after healthy localities for the settlement of Russian representatives, while the "Debats" has discovered French interests, French capital being involved "in the construction of the Asia Minor railway"! It matters nothing to us how the shadowy claim of suzerainty may be settled or otherwise; but it does matter that our commercial and political interests be safeguarded, and that too in a decisive manner.

The hopes of Russia in the Persian Gulf are explained by a correspondent of the "Times," writing from Odessa (December 21). "The condition of Russia's export trade with Northern Persia," he says, "is already in every way encouraging," after an uphill struggle with British trade. The like enterprise is in view in Southern Persia, and that is why Russia is bustling for a footing on the Persian Gulf. The Imperial finances are behind the Russian Steam Navigation Company, which has started running steamers from Odessa; so that the Company may complacently bear initial losses, if fate so wills it. The correspondent reviews Russia's trading with Persia during the past half century, showing the extent and the means of its development. Fifty years ago, while Persia sent to Russia goods of the value of 3½ million roubles annually, Russia exported to Persia less than one million roubles' worth. "At that date practically the whole of Persia's trade was in the hands of the British." After the Crimean War, special attention was given to the Russo-Persian trade, and "all manner of privileges were granted to Russians trading between the Caucasus and Persia, with the satisfactory result that towards the eighties the value of Russia's export trade with Persia had already quadrupled." Then, in 1883, the Russian authorities "abolished entirely the right to free transit on goods exported by Persia into Russia through the Caucasus," and "at the same time they granted bounties on cotton and other goods manufactured in Russia and exported into Persia," and "increased the number of customs posts on the Russo-Persian frontier and authorised the transit duty-free" of a number of articles "the excise on which had previously been remitted by the Russian Excise Department." In consequence, in the 14 years 1883-97, Russia's exports to Persia again quadrupled in value, being worth in the last named year over 16,000,000 roubles. With improved communications, naturally Russia hopes for more and more. It is for British traders to fight the British commercial battle, but that ought not to imply political action for the crippling of the Russians.

In the able and interesting address which Dr. Mylne, late Bishop of Bombay, delivered in Westminster Abbey on the Genius of Hinduism, one striking difference between that religion and Christianity is well shown. To the Hindu God is infinite, and it, therefore, logically follows that nothing is outside God. The Christian, too, believes that God is infinite, but, says Dr. Mylne, "We, believing in a God who commands, and in a creature who obeys, boldly set logic at defiance." To the Christian, responsibility and personality are more important than logic. But how are the Hindus, logical before everything, to be induced to accept this apparently illogical creed? Dr. Mylne answers, By arousing in them the conviction of sin. According to him, the success of missions in the first place depends on the answer to this question, "Do they before all things drive home God's shaft of conviction, the sense of sin, into the half-debauched, wholly enfeebled, wholly slumbering, conscience of Hindu life?" Dr. Mylne has told us that the Christian is not always logical, but in view of the high standard of practical morality which prevails among the Hindus, does it not follow, either that this description of the Hindu conscience is erroneous, or that conscience is unnecessary to moral conduct?

In the "Sunday School Chronicle," the Rev. Richard Burges writes on Christmas in India. With much that he says about the keeping of that hallowed season by the English there we cordially agree, though it seems a harsh judgment on the British soldier to suggest that many are only saved from turning that season into a time of sin by the existence of Soldiers' Homes. But it is in regard to what the writer says of Indian children that our most serious difficulty arises. He looks forward to

> a great in-gathering of India's child-life and youth-life. This recent famine means a legacy of some 25,000 children for Protestant Christian Orphanages.

Now in England, the Courts exercise the greatest care that orphan children shall be brought up in the religion of their parents. Those who should take advantage of their helpless position to turn them from the religion of their parents, would be the subjects of just animadversion. If this is right in England, how can it be wrong in India? The Famine Commission laid it down that the State should be the temporary guardian of deserted children, and that where possible they should be handed over to persons of the same religion. Why should a father, because he dies of famine, lose the right to have his children brought up in his own faith? And how can any religious body think it a matter for congratulation that its numbers are swelled by the contravention of this sacred principle?

Mr. F. B. Taylor, Judicial Commissioner of Chota Nagpur and an officiating puisne judge of the High Court of Calcutta, has recently issued a little book entitled the "Trial of Cases, or an Epitome of Common Errors in the Trial of Criminal and Civil Cases, with suggestions for their correction and avoidance," which contains some criticism of the lower magistracy. The book, though not without its use, would scarcely have attracted or deserved our attention, had it not brought forth in the Anglo-Indian "Pioneer" a most hearty defence of Indian magistrates. Answering Mr. Taylor's indictment, our contemporary says: "It is not suggested that justice is refused, or that wilful perversity is shown in material matters, or that the innocent are oppressed. The defects are defects of form." Then follows a reference to "justices' justice" in England. "And we get something better than that. The ordinary deputy magistrate dispenses better law than the average bench of English justices of the peace, and is not their inferior in common sense."

Our contemporary points out that the deputy magistrate has many and various duties. He is generally over-worked. From the variety of his occupations he will gain in breadth, but it is only in exceptional cases that he will be found capable of that exact adherence to every minute requirement of formal procedure which is expected from those who are occupied solely with judicial business. But these magistrates "are on the whole a hard-working reliable and intelligent body of officials, who toil patiently year in and year out at most necessary but usually unattractive labour, and they need encouragement rather than disparagement." It would be well if this testimony to the good qualities of the Indian magistracy was kept in mind by English travellers who return from India full of tales of the misconduct of Indian officials, which those who know the Indians best are the first to discredit.

THE SEVENTEENTH NATIONAL CONGRESS.

THE Seventeenth Session of the Indian National Congress was opened at Calcutta yesterday, under the presidency of Mr. Dinshaw Edulji Wacha, the well-known Chairman of the Municipality of Bombay. As yet we have not received any details of the proceedings, but we do not doubt that, when accounts reach this country, they will be accompanied, as usual, with more or less ill-informed and virulent commentary on a body that is just as loyal and as intelligent as any other association for political purposes within the Empire. In view of this tolerably certain contingency, we reprint on another page an article contributed to the "Law Magazine and Review" of April, 1895, by one of the most able and distinguished Anglo-Indians —the Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, K.C., late Chief-Justice of Bengal—in defence of the Indian National Congress, which had been assailed in vituperative language in the "Nineteenth Century" of the preceding June by the late General Sir George Chesney, K.C.B. Nobody will question that Sir Richard Garth is as fully entitled to a hearing on this subject as any other Anglo-Indian that could be named; and, from his official position, it may fairly be claimed that his judgment commands the highest possible respect. Nor can it be urged that it is his political bias that ranges him on the side of the Congress, for he himself declares that he is "at least as strong a Tory as Sir George Chesney himself." Indeed Sir Richard for some years represented Guildford in the House of Commons in the Conservative interest. But he is also an English sportsman: he played cricket on the Eton fields, and he captained the Oxford Eleven: and naturally he stands up for fair play. He went out to India in 1875, he tells us, "believing, as most Englishmen do, that our Government there was a model of paternal rule," and he "was most unwilling to come to any other conclusion, until the truth forced itself upon him with a weight which it was impossible to resist." The judicial mind recognises the truth, and does homage to it. Unfortunately not all minds are of the judicial cast. Sir Richard set forth an analysis of members present at the Allahabad Congress in 1888, and showed that they were "thoroughly representative as regards religion as well as their rank and profession," and were no more "an isolated class" than are "the members of the Carlton or the Reform or any other club in London." Asking what "these gentlemen" had done to deserve Sir George Chesney's invective, Sir Richard made this memorable answer:—

> I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government, in order to lend a helping hand to these poor people.
>
> They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past, which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy.
>
> This is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford City, and the relentless persecution of the Government of India.

Those who still take it to be a note of patriotism and Imperialism to malign the Congress will do well to consider these weighty words of noble vindication.

Last week we referred in general terms to the work that has been done by the Congress. We are by no means sure that the greatest work of all is its negative work—the results do not appear in any particular reform or political change. The mere existence of such a body, composed and conducted as is the Congress, operates silently, yet none the less effectively, to deter Government from proceedings that might otherwise be initiated. It tempers materially the action of despotism. This is an aspect of Congress efficiency that is apt to be overlooked by its critics, simply because it does not lie on the surface; yet there it is nevertheless, and its value, especially in these recent years, is not readily to be over-estimated. Focussing as it admittedly does the educated opinion of the country, it brings into a single channel the whole active force of Native thought and feeling on political affairs; and as education penetrates into the dumb and inert masses of the people, the more strongly does it feed the energies of the Congress. Already the Congress has created a popular opinion in India which may fairly be styled National: it has caused all thoughtful minds to regard India as a Nation—to consider public affairs as matters of common interest. This, we take it, is an achievement of very high significance. It would be an instructive lesson to the detractors of the Congress to study the series of Resolutions passed at its meetings during the last sixteen years, and more instructive still to consider the speeches delivered in connexion with the Resolutions, as well as the Presidential Addresses. Nor does the activity of the Congress end in talk. Those who demand particular results may readily be satisfied. As Sir Richard Garth pointed out, the Indian Councils Act of 1892 "was a reform entirely due to the strenuous exertions of the Congress. It was proposed and carried at their very first meeting in 1885," and was persistently pressed till at last Mr. Gladstone yielded to the demand. Sir George Chesney actually attempted to give the credit of the Act to the Government of India, but Sir Richard properly explained that it was a measure which the Government of India "had been steadily resisting as long as they could, and which they were only obliged to take in hand at last for the purpose of defeating, as far as possible, the more liberal intentions of Parliament." The demand for Simultaneous Examinations in England and India for the Civil Service was endorsed by the House of Commons; and it is only owing to the autocrat recalcitrancy of the Government of India that the Parliamentary Resolution has never been put in force. The Congress demand for equitable financial treatment, voiced by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, resulted in the Expenditure Commission, which saved a good quarter of a million sterling a year to India, and exposed extensively the inherent weakness of the Government's case on points not conceded—not as yet conceded. The "Forward Policy," if only scotched, not killed, has been compelled to assume a guise that has led even the "Manchester Guardian" to conclude that the Lawrence policy is actually in operation on the North-West Frontier. A Legislative Council for the Punjab was steadily advocated by the Congress. The views of Congressmen as to the plague regulations and their working were first contemned and eventually adopted, with the result that riots and discontent gave place to peace and harmony. The Famine Commission expressed the opinion that the true preventive of the indebtedness of the people is to be found "in the promotion of education, in the development of proper and popular institutions for organising credit and thrift at the very door of the cultivator, in the removal of the causes inherent in the agrarian system of the country which force the cultivator into debt, and in the advancement of agricultural efficiency in all its branches." So short a time ago as Oct. 18 (INDIA, vol. xvi, p. 181), we showed in detail how every one of these remedies, newly discovered by the Commission, have for years and years been persistently urged by the Congress. As we have had occasion to say before, the marvel is that, in face of the adverse circumstances, the Congress has been able to do, in India and in England, even a tithe of what it has actually accomplished.

There are many reforms in various stages of ripeness to which we have not referred; such as the separation of judicial and executive functions, which cannot now be long delayed. But if we are not inclined to count our chickens before they are hatched, we have some right to remind our friends, as well as our detractors, that the process of hatching is sufficiently difficult and costly. We think it well, too, to insist on the foresight of the Congress in pointing out to Government the urgency of many questions that Government will not of itself readily take up. Consider, for example, the second Resolution of the last Congress, at Lahore (INDIA, vol. xv, p. 190):—

> That having regard to the oft-recurring famines in India, and the manifestly decreasing power of resistance on the part of its population in the face of a single failure of harvest, leading as it frequently does to human suffering, loss of life, destruction of live stock, disorganisation of rural operations, and interference with the legitimate work of the administrative machinery, the Congress hereby earnestly prays that the Government of India may be pleased to institute at an early date a full and independent enquiry into the economic condition of the people of India with a view to the ascertainment and adoption of practicable remedies.

There is a root-and-branch question in the face of insistent

famine: "a FULL AND INDEPENDENT ENQUIRY into the ECONOMIC CONDITION of the people," with a view to possible PREVENTION of famine. And, if we turn to the thirteenth Resolution, we find the text of a Memorial to be submitted to the Viceroy in Council by a deputation appointed by the Congress, the second and third paragraphs of which deal with "the increasing poverty of the peasantry in the greater part of the country" as a "pressing problem," and the third paragraph of which runs thus:—

That in view of the condition to which the recent famines have reduced the rayats the Government will be so good as to cause an exhaustive enquiry to be instituted into their growing impoverishment by means of an independent Commission.

All this shows how closely the Congress is in touch with the people, and how clearly and cogently they bring under the notice of Government the "pressing problems" of the time. It is hoped that the Indian Famine Union will be able to strengthen the appeal of the Congress. This root question of economic reform is sure to figure prominently in the discussions of the Congress now sitting. It is a subject that Mr. Wacha, the President, is especially competent to handle. Indeed, we shall not be surprised if the Government soon discover that it has always been deeply impressed with the urgency of the matter and has at length decided that now is the accepted time and the day of salvation.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

Once again the season of goodwill has come round, and for the third year in succession it finds us engaged in deadly warfare with a race whose religion, like our own, is that of the Prince of Peace. Basutos and Bechuanas, Swazis and Zulus must detect in the conflict a more striking moral than any that our missionaries have ever preached. There is but one text for the occasion—"Behold how these Christians love one another." Unhappily, the prospect of a cessation of hostilities seems to be receding. Both sides are sick of the struggle, but each is too obstinate to make the first overtures for a settlement. The Boers would probably be willing to lay down their arms if we could bring ourselves to the point of assuring them that it would be to their interest to do so, while we, on our part, would be only too glad to concede terms to our brave enemy if the latter would pay our pride the compliment of throwing himself on our magnanimity. Lord Rosebery has indicated a way out of this absurd dilemma by reminding us of historic settlements that have sprung from casual meetings at wayside inns. The ex-Premier should go a step further. At all events, the whole world would be greatly interested if he were now to set out on a tour of the Netherlands.

Politicians are still discussing the latest Birmingham riot. Some days ago Mr. Lloyd George visited Mr. Chamberlain's pocket borough on the invitation of the local Liberal Association, and at the risk of his life attended a meeting in the historic building which Mr. John Bright once described as the temple of free speech. The temple was almost wrecked; Mr. Lloyd George had to seek safety in flight, disguised, it is said, in the uniform of a policeman; twenty or thirty people were carried from the meeting to the hospitals; one man was killed; and the "Birmingham Daily Post," in a grave review of the situation, solemnly declared that but for the usual good humour of Birmingham crowds the proceedings might have culminated in an angry and dangerous riot. Happily, the good humour of Birmingham prevailed, and thus prevented the necessity for more than one inquest.

Mr. Chamberlain has not yet expressed his view of the episode. An irresponsible interviewer, it is true, attributed to the right hon. gentleman an observation from which the public were led to infer that while the Colonial Secretary regretted the damage to the Town Hall, he sympathised with the attack on the member for Carnarvon. Mr. Chamberlain, however, has contradicted the report. Unfortunately, he has offered no condemnation of the outrageous conduct of his henchmen. Mr. Balfour will doubtless remind him of his duty, and he could not perform the task more effectively than by repeating the actual words which were employed by himself on the last occasion of the kind. "Mr. Chamberlain," said Mr. Balfour on that occasion, "appears to think that he is in no way bound to condemn what has taken place in Birmingham. I wish, however, to remind the right hon. gentleman that in some cases not to blame is to praise, and not to declare an act wrong is to allow it by implication to be right. The right hon. gentleman in whose borough the outrage occurred is bound as a Minister of the Crown to condemn it, on pain of being regarded as a party to it." History repeats itself, but with variations. The Aston riots of fifteen years ago have just been repeated in the same neighbourhood, but it will be a miracle indeed if the reproof which they elicited from Mr. Balfour should likewise be repeated at Westminster.

One might carry these researches into a forgotten era much further, and show, for example, how Lord George Hamilton, now one of Mr. Chamberlain's most loyal colleagues and devoted admirers, called on Mr. Gladstone to repudiate the right hon. gentleman's condonation of outrage; how Mr. Chamberlain exasperated Sir H. Drummond Wolff by stigmatising him as Lord Randolph Churchill's jackal; how Sir H. Drummond Wolff denounced Mr. Chamberlain's "usual insolence"; how Mr. Chaplin mockingly invited Mr. Chamberlain to call him—yea, the magnificent Henry himself—a hyæna, and finally how Lord Randolph Churchill boasted of his success in drawing the badger. But it is unnecessary to go so far back for one's example of chaste Parliamentary diction. We have still a Wanklyn to enrich our vocabularies. "This disgusting demagogue," "this man," "this Lloyd George"—these are a few of the choice terms in which one member of the House of Commons referred to another, only a few days ago. Mr. Chamberlain must be proud of his disciples.

Some personal impressions of the recent Viceregal visit to Mandalay by a correspondent who writes from Burma, may be of interest to readers of INDIA. The writer had never before seen Lord Curzon, and his description of the Viceroy and of the impression made by his Excellency's appearance on the native mind is extremely entertaining: "In appearance, the Viceroy is distinctly prepossessing. Tall, though not so tall as the Lieutenant-Governor, broad-shouldered, clean-shaven, and with a good colour, he reminds one of the old pictures of the Prince Consort, and is certainly like a gentleman of the old-fashioned school. His voice is good, but much of what he said was extremely cynical. Apparent compliments were in reality the reverse to one who knew the subjects on which he spoke." At the Durbar, Lord Curzon appears to have been quite a regal figure. "He was magnificently dressed. Front and back, his coat was covered with gold lace, while the blue ribbon which suspended the great gold star of the Grand Commander of the Star of India matched well his bright complexion. Physically, he looked a fit man to be the Governor-General of India, and his bearing and appearance impressed the Burmans immensely. Some of them had an idea that he was a brother of the King and a German!"

From the same correspondent comes a glowing narrative of the Government House festivities. The most amusing feature of the garden party was a kind of regatta on the Palace moat, in which sixteen boats took part, each with a crew of from twenty-seven to thirty-two Burmans. The Viceroy, after interviewing the Shan and Burmese Princesses, who were in a reserved enclosure, allowed himself to be towed in a decorated barge by two of the racing boats, whose crews were fancifully dressed for the occasion. Although the water pageant appears to have been somewhat ineffective, the general spectacle is described as magnificent. "The waters of the broad moat glistening in the setting sun, the cloud-encircled hills that surround the plain in which Mandalay stands, the long line of battlements behind, broken here and there by pavilion-crowned gates and towers, and, in front, rising on the heights above the moat, a wall of pink and white silk jackets representing thousands of Burman spectators, presented a unique picture, and one which must have impressed Lord Curzon, accustomed though he is to spectacular shows of all sorts." One effect of the Viceroy's visit, it appears, is to be a restoration of the Palace of Mandalay, or, at least, the removal to some other building of certain institutions which are now housed under the roof of that great and historic edifice.

Londoners have succeeded in scotching, if not in slaying, the pantomime tyranny under which so many unfortunate communities groan at this season of the year. Among the West-end theatres, Drury Lane stands alone in its loyalty to the tradition of Clown, Pantaloon, and Columbine, Bluebeards and Fatimas, ugly sisters and wicked uncles, fairies

who pirouette and have their being within an aureole of limelight, and wicked demons with a salamander-like appetite for red-fire. But even now the poor playgoer, like the heroine of Maeterlinck's play, "is not happy." True, pantomime is dying, but the nursery still claims its Christmas tribute. In other words plays written for children—some of which, moreover, might have been written by children—are in possession of half-a-dozen of the best stages in London. Actors and actresses of from ten to fifteen years' experience of life are strutting their little hour in piping little pieces, and the Scandinavian drama recedes into gloom a mere rejected problem. Even the Old Playgoer begins to cherish a belated gratitude for the adult humours of Drury Lane.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, December 19.—Mr. Asquith addressed a Liberal meeting at Bilston. He said Lord Rosebery's Chesterfield speech had cleared and defined the political situation. The country welcomed the reappearance of Lord Rosebery as an active political councillor and guide. He himself did not hesitate to say that he adhered to the policy laid down by Lord Rosebery, both on its critical and its constructive side, without any important reservation. After condemning the organized and concerted rowdyism which had prevented free speech at Birmingham on the previous night, Mr. Asquith turned to the question of the war. The nation wanted an honourable and durable peace, and he declined to countenance any such proposal as the supersession of Lord Milner. The peace proposals should provide a sufficient safeguard against a recurrence of past dangers, and should be such as would lay the foundations in South Africa of free self-governing communities. But military operations must for the present be pursued with unflagging vigour and alertness. The present Government had squandered their money, bungled their diplomacy, mismanaged the war, neglected education and domestic legislation.

Sir R. Reid, M.P., speaking at a Liberal meeting in Liverpool, said there were portions of Lord Rosebery's speech with which he could not agree, but with a great deal of it he entirely agreed. He advocated a settlement in South Africa on the footing of consent rather than of subjugation.

Sir E. Clarke, K.C., addressed a meeting, held at the Hotel Cecil, under the auspices of the Parliamentary Procedure Committee, in support of the principle of carrying over uncompleted Bills in Parliament from one Session to another. In the course of his address, Sir Edward expressed a hope that the Government, in their proposals for the reform of procedure, would not seek to extend the length of the sittings of the House of Commons, or to increase the powers of the Government over the proceedings of the House. After offering various suggestions as to the reform of procedure, he spoke strongly in support of the carrying over of Bills from one Session to another as a reform which went to the root of Parliamentary delay and obstruction.

FRIDAY, December 20.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer received at the Treasury a deputation who sought for an augmentation in the annual Government grant to University colleges. The proceedings were private, but Sir M. Hicks Beach was understood to have replied that while he could not pledge himself to any increase of the grant, he would do his best to prevent any loss falling on the colleges which were now in receipt of it by the admission of new colleges to its benefits.

The remainder of Kritzinger's commando was being closely pursued. A Boer commando 100 strong was reported to be encamped 36 miles north-east of Carnarvon, Cape Colony. The trial of the rebel leader Scheepers began at Graaf Reinet on Wednesday. There were 30 charges against him, including murder, arson, train-wrecking, and cruelty to prisoners. He pleaded not guilty. Mr. Barton, the Australian Premier, stated that the Federal Government was unable to offer troops to the War Office without a substantial suggestion that they were needed.

A Reuter telegram from Bombay stated that the Sultan of Turkey had sent a special emissary to Koweyt to call on the Sheikh Mubarakh to proceed to Constantinople and make obeisance to him as his suzerain, threatening to remove him if he refused. It was understood that the emissary had not been allowed to land. Mubarakh had again appealed for British protection, for he was once more threatened by the Sultan of Nejd. A British cruiser and gunboat were now at Koweyt. The Russian cruiser Variag had just arrived in the Persian Gulf.

SATURDAY, December 21.—Lord Rosebery was presented with the freedom of the borough of Swansea, and in acknowledging the honour said the subject of municipal work was one which had a great fascination for him. In his judgment it would often be a good thing if, with regard to a large question of expenditure, the municipal body, after giving this information, took a public vote of the community as to whether they wished to proceed with the expenditure or not. He had observed also that electoral criticisms in regard to expenditure related almost invariably to matters of detail, and not to matters of large expenditure. The municipal ratepayer was always straining at gnats and swallowing camels. After referring to the financial position of the Paris municipality as a warning against profuse municipal expenditure, Lord Rosebery suggested that every town ought to have a ratepayers' association of a thoroughly efficient character to check unnecessary expenditure; and he further urged that it was the plain and obvious duty of every man of capacity, education, and public spirit to try to take part in the government of the place in which he lived.

The "Times" correspondent reported from Standerton that on Thursday Colonel Allenby surprised a Boer laager of 100 men at Schoongezicht, 22 miles south of Balmoral, capturing 33 prisoners, 150 cattle, and 40 horses. Lord Methuen's columns, after a night march, surprised Commandant Potgieter's commando last Wednesday near the Makwasi Hills. Potgieter himself, with 60 men, escaped, but his family and papers, with 19 prisoners, 89 waggons, 47 carts, 1,911 cattle, 28,380 sheep, 158 horses, 183 donkeys and mules, some ammunition, and a large quantity of grain were captured. Colonel Monro had taken prisoner 15 rebels belonging to Myburg's commando, to the south of Barkly East. Commandant Haazbroek, with two other Boers, had been killed in an encounter with General Barker's column in the Doornberg. General Dartnell, with a body of Imperial Light Horse and Yeomanry, had a severe encounter near Langberg last Wednesday with De Wet, who had 800 men, a gun, and a Pom-Pom. After four hours' fighting the Boers were driven off, losing five killed, 20 wounded, and two prisoners. The British had one man killed and four officers and ten men wounded. The Canadian Government was going to send a field hospital with its contingent to South Africa. The Federal Government of Australia had decided to send a contingent of 1,000 men to the seat of war.

A report received in Constantinople from Basra stated that the Turkish flag, having been hoisted over the residence of the Sheikh Mubarakh at Koweyt, was hauled down by the commander of the British gunboat there, who hoisted in its place Mubarakh's own flag in token of the Sheikh's independence.

MONDAY, December 23.—Lord Kitchener, in telegrams of Saturday and Sunday, reported sharp fighting on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, in the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. He described General Dartnell's action with De Wet near Landberg, and said that General Spens reported from Transvalia that 200 of the 14th Mounted Infantry, under Major Bridgford, while searching farms in the neighbourhood of Begin-der-lyn, were attacked by 300 Boers and 40 armed natives. A portion of the Mounted Infantry were overwhelmed before General Spens could come to their assistance. The casualties were severe, but the details were not yet to hand. In the Orange River Colony Colonels Damant's and Rimington's columns, marching parallel three miles apart, had reached Tafelkop on Friday morning, when Damant's advanced guard was attacked by 800 Boers under M. Botha, who rushed a kopje commanding the main body and guns, but were driven off before Colonel Rimington could come up. Colonel Damant was dangerously wounded; two officers and twenty men were killed, and three officers and seventeen men wounded. Rimington pursued the enemy vigorously, driving the Boers across the Wilge River, when they dispersed in all directions. They left six dead on the ground, and Rimington during the pursuit captured five, including a commandant. A Boer who came in under a flag of truce to ask leave to remove the dead admitted to having already buried 27. In a later telegram Lord Kitchener said that Colonel Damant was progressing favourably, and had dictated further details respecting the action, from which it appeared that when the Boers first advanced he mistook them for General Hamilton's Yeomanry. Lord Kitchener also reported that Colonel Mackenzie had surprised Barond Smit's commando in the Eastern Transvaal, killing six men and taking sixteen prisoners; and that Colonel Park had repelled an attack at Elandspruit by Muller's and Trichaardt's commando. The enemy lost eight killed and three wounded; our loss was seven men killed and six officers and 18 men wounded.—Mr. Chamberlain telegraphed to Mr. Barton, the Australian Federal Premier, stating that, in view of the prolongation of hostilities in South Africa, the Imperial Government would gladly accept another Australian contingent 1,000 strong. Mr. Barton replied that the Federal Government would gladly raise this force, and would have been prepared to supply a larger number of men.

The Queen was still suffering from slight indisposition, and it was practically decided that neither her Majesty nor the King would now proceed to Sandringham to spend Christmas there.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

"MR. HYNDMAN'S INDICTMENT."

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—I am really sorry to trouble you with another letter, but I must try to put myself right with the public, if not with Mr. Hyndman; and to begin with may as well withdraw the words he specially objects to as to his arguments on one point being the "merest clap-trap." The expression is evidently inappropriate. I must also explain that I have only seen the one letter of his which you reproduced, and was therefore unaware of the "misprint, or slip of the pen." May I point out again that I have been, ever since 1868 at any rate, perhaps a more out-and-out opponent of the salt tax than even Mr. Hyndman. I did not say that it does not press the people of India now, but that, taking the country as a whole, it is not so oppressive as it used to be. The quantity of salt actually purchased by the coolie is, unfortunately, so small that it does not matter very much to him whether the Government price is 1 or 2 Rs. for 82 lbs. of it. True he does not get as much as he ought, and that is my reason for objecting to the tax altogether; for, as long as salt is a Government monopoly, he never will get enough, no matter how low the tax may be.

2. Now to reply very briefly to Mr. Hyndman's present letter as far as deems necessary in order to explain my position. In the first place, it must not be assumed that the Government of India has nothing more to say for itself than I have put forward. I am in no way authorised to speak for the Government of India, nor have I ever attempted to write its defence: I have only endeavoured to correct what appear to me obvious mis-statements wherever I find them.

Secondly, Mr. Hyndman doesn't say whether "insurance" (or peace) is a "commercial return," or not; or how much (if anything) he would be willing to pay for it.

Thirdly, I never said (nor thought) that "permanent famine" was "cheaply purchased by the immunity which India now enjoys from the trouble and turmoil prevailing" when we came into possession of it. That is a complete misrepresentation of my argument. I merely said that India might fairly be expected to pay something on account of insurance: I expressly said that I thought she was paying too much at present. Does Mr. Hyndman propose that we should leave the country at once, or how does he propose to stop the "drain"?—Yours, etc.,

J. B. Pennington.

December 22, 1901.

SIR RICHARD GARTH ON THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

In view of the Seventeenth Session of the Indian National Congress which opened yesterday in Calcutta under the presidency of Mr. D. E. Wacha, it may be interesting, especially for the information of our readers in the United Kingdom and in America, to recall Sir Richard Garth's account of the Congress.

His article appeared in the "Law Magazine and Review" for February, 1895. It is hardly necessary to add that Sir Richard Garth, M.A., K.C., etc., is an ex-Chief Justice of Bengal, a Privy Councillor, and a sound Conservative, who, at one time, represented Guildford in the House of Commons.

A review of the Congress from the pen of a Tory lawyer who was educated at Eton and Christ Church will hardly be expected to err on the side of excessive cordiality.

Sir Richard Garth wrote:—

Of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years, there is none in my opinion which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress. There is no subject, I consider, upon which the English press and the English public have been so cruelly and persistently misled by the Government party.

Sir G. Chesney's Attack.

As an illustration of the sort of spirit which animates them against the Congress, I would refer to an article written by Sir George Chesney, K.C.B., in the "Nineteenth Century" for June last.

Sir George Chesney, I need hardly say, is an Indian officer of high position. He has spent the better part of his life in the service of the Government, and he was a member of the Viceregal Council from 1886 to 1891.

He is, moreover, well known as the author of a work styled "Indian Polity," which has just gone through a third edition in the press. He is a staunch supporter of the Government of India, and we may, therefore, I presume, accept what he says in the article to which I have alluded as being substantially in accordance with Government views and principles.

Its "Spirit of Intolerance."

If any of my readers have not seen that article, I invite them to read it. It illustrates very forcibly the spirit of intolerance to which I have alluded, and I can hardly conceive anything more calculated to wound the feelings and excite the disaffection of a people keenly sensitive to ridicule and insult, than the tone and language in which they are spoken of in that article.

He describes the Indian people generally as absolutely unfit for free institutions; and if I understand him rightly, he would wish to deprive them, if he could, of those three great blessings, which we are taught to regard as the very elements of freedom—a free Press, a free Bar, and the right of publicly discussing their political views and opinions.

But his attacks are more particularly directed against the "Indian National Congress." He holds it up in most contemptuous language to the ridicule and obloquy of the English people. He speaks of it as "a class outside and apart from the people of India, properly so-called; a body made up of pleaders in the Law Courts, ex-students from Government Colleges, and the class which works the Native Press." He derides their proceedings, insults their chairmen, and winds up by saying: "In fact the holders of these Congresses are a set of inept blundering political charlatans. They have never made one useful or practical suggestion, but their proceedings, when not merely silly, are undoubtedly mischievous."

As Strong a Tory as Sir G. Chesney.

Now I think I ought to say, before I proceed further, that so far as I am personally concerned, I am at least as strong a Tory as Sir George Chesney himself. I mention this, not because I am weak enough to suppose that anybody cares at all what my political views may be, but merely to satisfy my readers, if I can, before I come to deal with the pith of my subject, that I am not at all likely to take too Radical a view of the Indian situation, or to espouse the cause of the people against the Government, except for some very good reason. I went out to India in 1875, believing, as most Englishmen do, that our Government there was a model of paternal rule, and I was most unwillingly to come to any other conclusion, until the truth forced itself upon me with a weight which it was impossible to resist.

Composition and Aims of the Congress.

Having said thus much, I will now deal with what seems to be the principal object of Sir George Chesney's attacks, namely, the National Congress, and I consider:—

First, who the gentlemen are who compose the Congress; and,

Secondly, what they have done to deserve Sir George Chesney's obloquy and insults.

1st. The Indian National Congress is a large, influential, and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who, since 1885, have at the close of each year met at one or other of the large centres in India, such as Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, to discuss their political views and opinions.

They consist of delegates from every part of India, who are duly elected at a number of divisional head-quarters. We are told that, at the Congress meeting in Allahabad, in the year 1888, fully three millions of men took a direct part in the election of these delegates, who themselves numbered no fewer than 1,248. The constitution of this important body was thoroughly representative; it consisted of Princes, Rajas, Nawabs, 54 members of noble families, Members of Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and commissioners of municipalities, Fellows of Universities, members of Local Boards, and professional men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, journalists, landed proprietors, shopkeepers, clergymen, priests, Professors of Colleges, Zemindars, and others.

I should also say that they were thoroughly representative as regards religion, as well as their rank and profession.

The Hindus, of various castes, numbered ...	964
The Mahometans	222
The Christians	38
The Jains	11

Thus we see how utterly unfounded is the statement made by Sir George Chesney that the Congress is largely made up "of pleaders in the Law Courts, of ex-students from the Government Colleges, and the class which works the Native Press."

So far as Bengal is concerned, I know it to be untrue. I am personally acquainted with several of these gentlemen. They have often been guests at my own house. I have met them constantly in the best Native society in Calcutta, at Government House Levées, and at Government House parties: and I should think that Sir George Chesney, although he may not have known them personally, must frequently have met them there himself.

Its Members not "An Isolated Class."

It is also utterly untrue that they are, as Sir George Chesney would suggest, "an isolated class." They are no more isolated than the members of the Carlton or the Reform or any other Club in London; and I may also say that I know many Native gentlemen of high rank and position, who, although thoroughly favourable to its views, have been deterred from taking as direct and open a part in the Congress proceedings as they would have wished to do, by the

determined jealous hostility which the Government have manifested towards the movement.

2nd. And now, secondly, let us see what these gentlemen have done to deserve Sir George Chesney's invective.

He says that they are "a set of inept blundering political charlatans; that they have never made one useful or practical suggestion, and that their proceedings, when not merely silly, are undoubtedly mischievous." This is the language in which the member for Oxford, a General in Her Majesty's Army, and K.C.B., thinks fit to insult these gentlemen, who were only lately under his rule as one of the members of the Viceregal Council; and now, what have they done to deserve this choice invective?

Their Courage and Patriotism.

I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government, in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people.

They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses, which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past; which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance, which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy.

This is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford city, and the relentless persecution of the Government of India.

And now, as to their never having made one useful or practical suggestion, and as to their proceedings, when not merely silly, being undoubtedly mischievous, I am afraid Sir George Chesney must be a little oblivious.

The Indian Councils Act.

What does he say to the Indian Councils Act of 1892?

That was a reform, I take leave to say, entirely due to the strenuous exertions of the Congress. It was proposed and carried at their very first meeting in 1885. They pressed it in vain upon the attention of the Government year after year, until at last Mr. Gladstone yielded to their urgent solicitations by passing the Act of 1892.

It certainly is rather amusing under these circumstances, to find Sir George Chesney, in the last edition of his "Indian Polity," actually modest enough to attempt to take credit to the Government of India for passing this measure, which they had been steadily resisting as long as they could, and which they were only obliged to take in hand at last, for the purpose of defeating, as far as possible, the more liberal intentions of Parliament.

As regards the Viceregal Council, I am sorry to say they have succeeded in reducing the intended reform almost to a dead letter. The Government still have entirely their own way in the Council, and their officials are forced to vote for them, whether they will or no. Only witness the lamentable scene which occurred the other day at Calcutta on the question of the cotton duties, when the whole of the non-official members voted against the Government, and some of the official members would have done the same, had they not been forced, like so many dummies, to obey the orders of the Secretary of State. What a mockery to call this a Legislative Council!

Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions.

Look again at the resolution so strongly urged by the Congress from the very first in favour of the separation of executive and judicial functions. It is almost impossible to conceive the injustice that has been worked in India by uniting these powers in the same official. The Government know this perfectly well; the Courts of Justice have urged it over and over again; the whole of the non-official community in India abhors the present system; and I am happy to say that after a long struggle on the part of the Congress two successive Secretaries of State (Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley) have, in the House of Lords, admitted its iniquity. But the Government still clings to the abuse.

Then, again, look at the following resolutions of Congress:

1. Against the enormously increasing military expenditure, which Sir Auckland Colvin considers, in common with thousands of other good men, as the main cause of India's distress.
2. In favour of reform in the Police Administration, which, indeed, is most sorely needed.
3. In favour of a Legislative Council for the Punjab.
4. In favour of allowing prisoners in warrant cases to be tried (if they wish it) at the Sessions.
5. In favour of Lord Northbrook's motion in the House of Lords, for a strict enquiry into the Home charges.
6. In favour of appointing barristers instead of civilians to some of the district judgeships.
7. In favour of the establishment of military colleges in India; a resolution which, we were given to understand, was favourably considered by the Duke of Connaught.

I do not enlarge upon these resolutions, because the English public would hardly understand their merits; but speaking for myself, I entirely approve them; and they have also been approved by thousands of well-informed, educated gentlemen, who, I take leave to say, with all respect to Sir George Chesney, know quite as much about their merits as Government officers.

I quite admit there are other resolutions with which I disagree as strongly as Sir George Chesney; as, for instance, the one in favour of simultaneous examinations in England and India for the Civil Service. If that were carried out, the English element in the service would be inevitably swamped in a very few years; and it would be absolutely impossible to carry on British rule in India without a competent staff of British officials to work it.

But at the same time it seems hardly respectful to call the Congress leaders a set of "inept political charlatans," merely because they pass a resolution which a majority in the House of Commons thinks proper to approve.

The Poverty of the Masses.

Sir George also, I see, finds fault with the Congress because in dealing with the poverty of the masses he imagines that they have lost sight of the fact that the Government has spent upwards of thirty millions of money during the last few years in trying to cope with this difficulty. But here again he is mistaken. The Congress are only too mindful of these facts, and well they may be; because "it is their money and the money of their fellow-countrymen" which has been spent in this way; and they think, and so, I believe, do the great mass of intelligent people in India, that a large proportion of it has been utterly wasted, and that it might have been far more profitably applied in other ways if the people (through the Provincial Councils or otherwise) could have had some voice in its application.

Confidence and Co-operation *v.* Despotic Intolerance.

Now I wish to say further, in conclusion, with regard to the Congress, that I defy any man to find fault with the perfect loyalty and respect to her Majesty and the Ruling Power, with which its proceedings are conducted. I have studied them from time to time very carefully; I have never seen a single instance of any disloyal sentiment or expression; and I invite Sir George Chesney or any one else to point out anything of the kind.

It seems to me that, so far from being in any way objectionable, the Congress affords an open, honest and loyal means of making the views and wishes of the most intelligent section of the Indian people known to the Government. We want no secret societies, no Nihilists or Socialists, either here or in India; and I firmly believe that, if the Congress or any similar institution had existed in India in the year 1857, we should never have experienced the horrors of the Indian Mutiny.

If our rulers in India, instead of trying to balance themselves on a dangerous pinnacle of despotic intolerance, would only descend to a safer level, and invite the confidence and co-operation of the people, I believe that they would find the task of government far easier in India than Lord Rosebery and his colleagues find it in the United Kingdom.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

"IMPERIALISM" IN PRACTICE.

THE "NATAL WITNESS" ON "HUMAN SHODDY."

The "Colonial Indian News," an Anglo-Tamil journal published at Pietermaritzburg, Natal, prints the following in its issue of November 15, under the heading "The 'Natal Witness' and 'Human Shoddy'":—

We are much obliged to a correspondent who was so kind as to send us a copy of the "Natal Witness" of the 28th October, and he requests us to deal with the leading article under the heading of "Human Shoddy" that appeared in its columns. Our esteemed contemporary is of opinion that the Colonies and the British Empire will thrive and prosper and will be pervaded by a spirit of enterprise and self-reliance so long as it is composed of various elements of European races, but if an attempt were made to include other nationalities in it, the "Witness" would not and could not endure such a thing, and our contemporary grows so pessimistic that it sounds a death-knell to the existence of the Empire in seeing the land passing in larger quantities every year into their (Indian) hands WHO, from semi-slave tillers, have become the owners of the soil. And our contemporary contends that

As long as those who helped to build up the Colonies be-

longed, not exclusively to the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic races, but to the great Teutonic Family, they shook down well together, and the institutions to which they have been accustomed having for the most part had some common origin, were such as were well fitted for common use and adaptation; but the enormous facilities for locomotion, by which modern science has proceeded so far in reducing the obstacles of space and time, save to promote the search for subsistence in its practical form of emigration, and the last century opened to us a perfectly new phase of the history of the human race and its breeds. We should trouble little about, indeed would be glad of, the vast scale of the emigration to the Colonies of the Teutonic, Scandinavian, and Latin races of Europe, which must inevitably as the years roll on become more gigantic; but what sort of an Empire will before this century closes take the place of the Empire as we see it, when it has become the happy hunting ground of the Mongolian and the Indian. Most Colonists recognise that there is something in the weight and dignity attaching to fellow-membership and fellow-citizenship in a great Empire, but how trifling in a few years will be the old Colonial leaven amidst a mass of human beings of every shade of colour and incapable of sharing in the feelings of the minority, and will not our ready acceptance of such a population, on terms of more or less equality, weaken the feelings of Englishmen towards those Colonies that suffer it? The waste lands of the Colonies, of which but a small proportion would be taken up by Colonists for several generations, have been regarded as a heritage of the English people, and we are giving transfer of it —it may be of only a few acres at a time at first, but will be of big blocks before long—to immigrants who have no claim upon us in any shape whatever, and which, increasing in a greater ratio than the European Colonist, will eventually pull the latter down if he will not take the evil in hand in time."

Our contemporary must be aware of the fact that civilisation had its origin in the Aryans who are said to be the common ancestors of both European and Asiatic races; and when slavery was in full swing in Europe, it was seldom carried on in India. When the real fact of the case stands thus, we are not a little surprised to note our contemporary using such high-flown malicious language against a race whose civilisation dates back from the remotest period of antiquity, and whose liberty and freedom are not inferior to those of other European races. Our contemporary has attained a notoriety unknown in the annals of journalism for writing such articles having for its object fomenting of ill-feeling and the fostering of race-hatred.

Returning to the matter in its issue of November 22, the "Colonial Indian News" writes:—

Our contemporary says that if the Colonies were to be comprised of European immigrants, it will prosper, and it sounds a death-knell to the existence of the Empire if the Asiatics were allowed a shadow of room in it. Evidently our esteemed contemporary has overlooked the fact that both Asiatic and European races owe their existence and their civilisation to our common ancestors the Aryans. It is they who were the most cultured and intelligent people when all other races were in the womb of civilisation. It has repeatedly been proved by writers in the public Press that modern civilisation is a continuous growth of the civilisation which was in vogue in primitive times. . . . . Let us see if we can reconcile with the logic of facts the theory which is advocated by the "Witness," and which is as follows:—"As long as those who helped to bind up the Colonies belonged, not exclusively to the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic races, but to the great Teutonic races, they shook down well together, and the institutions to which they have been accustomed having for the most part had some common origin, were such as were well fitted for common use and adaptation."

The proposition of the "Witness" is disproved by the experience of those who have had ample opportunity in the direct administration of the government of races belonging to Eastern and Western Aryans. Let us take, for instance, the administration of affairs in India. More than two centuries since that England has been holding the destiny of three hundred millions of people of the human race. Should the "shaking down" theory of our contemporary be correct and scientific, then Englishmen could not have "shaken down" together with Indians in India during such a long period. We take this occasion to quote the opinion of a few experienced Englishmen and veteran statesmen whose name and authority may perhaps tend to explode the imaginary theory of our esteemed contemporary.

General John Briggs says:—

> Mankind under similar circumstances in all parts of the globe will act alike. I find among my acquaintances who have long resided in India, that after travelling over Europe they have reason to think more highly of the Natives of India.

Victor Cousin:—

> On the other hand, when we read with attention the poetical and philosophical movements of the East, above all those of India, which are beginning to spread in Europe, we discover there so many truths, and truths so profound, and which make such a contrast with the meanness of the results at which the European genius has sometimes stopped, that we are constrained to bend the knee before that of the East, and to see in this cradle of the human race the native land of the highest philosophy.

Sir Charles A. Elliott, K.C.S.I.:—

> No one can live long in the country without feeling a real regard for its people, and it spoke well for the people of India that the complaint against them came mostly from those who had the least experience, and that those who had been longest in India, and had the completest knowledge of their habits, were those who felt most kindly towards them.

Friedrich Max Müller, LL.D.:—

> If I were to ask myself from what literature we here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India.

Marquis of Ripon, K.G.:—

> The rapidity of communication, the weekly mails, the frequent furloughs, in spite of their numerous advantages, all tend to a certain extent in that direction, and therefore it is a great satisfaction to feel that there are other circumstances connected with our time which may counteract the evil; and among them we may count that greater acquaintance which we possess in the present day with the history, the art, and the jurisprudence of the past which ought to help us to know better, to appreciate more highly, the Native civilisation of India—to feel how ignorant is the inclination to disparage it, and that it is upon the ancient foundations of that civilisation alone that we can hope to erect firm and enduring the superstructure of that wider and higher life which it should be the great aim of our Government to foster and advance. . . . . We are here in the midst of ancient peoples, possessed of civilisation, of literature, of art of their own; and our business is not to try and force them to regret their past, to forget all that is characteristic in their history and their traditions, and to convert themselves into bad imitations of modern Englishmen; but to place without stint, at their disposal, all the riches of Western science and Western culture, that they may blend them in one harmonious union with the treasures of their own Oriental learning. . . . (British) power and influence rest upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon any other foundation—aye, more than upon the valour of our soldiers and the reputation of our arms.

At the risk of prolixity we have quoted the opinions of those Englishmen whose name is still known as the embodiment of English statesmanship, and so, leaving the controversy raised by our contemporary to the impartial judgment of the public we proceed with the other part of the question. Our contemporary pertinently asks, "what sort of an Empire will before this century closes take the place of the Empire as we see it, when it has become the happy hunting ground of the Mongolian and the Indian?" Our contemporary is not ignorant of the fact that the British Empire is comprised of all those parts and territories that enjoy self-government in its entirety, self-government partially, and those that are under direct Crown Government. That is the kind of empire called the British Empire; even a school-boy is acquainted with this elementary truth of the geography of the British Empire. But if the "Witness" likes to indulge in the sentiment of giving a nomenclature to those self-governing Colonies and the British Isles, then Heaven bless its ignorance and stupidity. However, in spite of the ingenious names and imaginary theories of politics which appear in the columns of our contemporary, the intelligent public will take the British Empire as it has been, and it is sure to take even the augmentation that may be made to the British Empire by future conquests.

Coming next to our contemporary's argument it says, "most Colonists recognise that there is something in the weight and dignity attached to fellow-citizenship and fellow membership in a great Empire, but how trifling in a few years will be the old Colonial leaven amidst a mass of human beings of every shade of colour and incapable of sharing the feelings of the minority, and will not our ready acceptance of such a population on terms of more or less equality weaken the feelings of Englishmen towards those Colonies that suffer?" Our contemporary, it seems, takes the hypothesis for granted, that the British Empire is composed of races of various colour and creed, and as such, if the Government cares to work its machinery without causing any detriment to its work, then both the majority and the minority must come to a mutual understanding as to the policy to be adopted for the irreparable working of the governmental machinery.

But if the majority indicates anything like ill-feeling or prejudice against the minority, or in other words as the "Witness" would like to put it, if the majority is "incapable of sharing in the feelings of the minority" then it indicates the barrenness of British statesmanship. Hence, should the political propaganda of the "Witness" be accepted as the propelling motive of British statesmanship, and should British statesmen follow it closely, then the British Empire will be, in the words of the "Witness," tottering to its fall, and in this age of rapid changes the fall, or something approaching to it, might be sudden.

In spite of the pessimistic tone that dins our ears, we must confess we are not so pessimistic as our contemporary, and on the contrary we are too optimistic. We have great faith in the unceasing inventive power of British statesmen, and we have implicit confidence, in the words of Matthew Arnold, "in the ancient and inbred integrity of the English people," in their unsullied character, in their purity of purpose, and in their undaunted moral courage. If there was an Empire that was ever constructed on a scientific basis it is the British Empire, and as such it is bound to grow with the growth of science and civilisation. The progress of the British Empire is dependent on the freedom which its citizens enjoy; because, as Benjamin Kidd rightly said, "they offer the highest motives to emulation; amongst them the individual is freest, the selection fullest, the rivalry fairest." But should ever attempt be made to react against that scientific principle, then we will have reason to despair.

LORD G. HAMILTON AND SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

A SPECIMEN OF CONTROVERSIAL METHOD.

Replying to the toast of the Army and Navy at Chiswick Constitutional Club house dinner, on December 12, Lord George Hamilton said our opponents in South Africa fought not as a civilised enemy, but as a nation of hunters stalking human beings as animals. He continued:—

Considering the area of operations, the invasion of Russia by Napoleon was child's play to our campaign in South Africa. The Boers must be classified. Some were very good fellows—ultra-Tories, indeed, and would be the backbone of the Conservative party there in the future of the Colony. But others had become contaminated by Kaffir vices. He could not refrain from associating with that toast confusion to those in this country who, by their speeches, had been the means of preventing the enemy from giving in long ago. It seemed strange that Scotland, whose contribution to the death-roll in South Africa was, he believed, three times heavier than that of England, should have given them such a man as Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman. He would say it to his face and in the House of Commons, that his speeches had been the foundation of the calumny and vilification of our Army in South Africa, and habitually conveyed the impression that our troops were guilty of barbarism and inhumanity.

With reference to this statement, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman forwarded the following communication to Lord G. Hamilton:—

Belmont Castle, Meigle, Dec. 14.

Dear Lord George Hamilton,—I have read in to-day's newspaper a report of your speech at Chiswick on Thursday, in which you are represented to have said that you "repeated what you had said on a former occasion, and what you had been challenged to prove—that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's public speeches had served as a foundation for calumny and vilification of our troops in South Africa, and that not only did you repeat the statement that night, but you would be prepared to do so from your place in Parliament should Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman challenge you to do so."

If you mean this as an answer to my invitation to "make good your words" regarding me, will you allow me to point out that what I asked you to do was not that you should repeat your charge, but that you should prove it? Reassertion is not proof; it is merely a renewal of the original offence.

And the charge you brought against me at Dundee was not that which you now state. It was not that my speeches "served as a foundation for other people's calumny"; it was that I was myself a direct calumniator. You accused me of "the defamation of the conduct of our troops and the vilification of their conduct in the field." This is an absolutely unfounded charge, conveyed in definite and explicit words. These are the words which I have challenged you to justify by proof.—Yours very truly,

H. Campbell-Bannerman.

To this letter Lord George Hamilton replied as follows:—

India Office, 17th Dec., 1901.

Dear Sir Henry,—I received your letter of the 14th inst., which by some inadvertence on your part appeared in the Press before I had time to reply to the request it contained.

You ask for proofs of the assertion that you have calumniated and vilified the conduct of our troops in the field. I will state shortly the facts upon which I base that charge.

The peculiar modes by which the Boers carry on warfare, the absence of uniform or of any distinction between combatant and non-combatant, and the compulsion exercised upon those who had surrendered to break their parole by again taking the field, compelled our officers and men in South Africa to take special measures to counteract these uncivilised tactics. All measures so taken were dictated by military exigencies on the spot, and in their inception and prosecution were purely military, conceived and carried out by our soldiers in South Africa. Whilst this fact in no way diminishes the ultimate responsibility of the Government for the action so taken, it has an important bearing upon the application of the language you have been using.

On June 14th, in addressing a portion of your political followers, after denouncing the military measures recently put in force in South Africa, you ask: "When is a war not a war? When it was carried on by methods of barbarism in South Africa." There are only two belligerents in South Africa, the Boers and the British army. As your words could not apply to the Boers, they necessarily attach themselves to the British soldier. Such language coming from the tongue of one who has twice been the head of the British Army has been made, by a considerable section of the foreign Press, the foundation and mainspring of charges of the foulest character against the behaviour and honour of our Army.

Since June you have spoken often, and, whilst you have never condemned the Boer guerilla methods, you have never failed to impugn the counteracting measures these methods necessitate. Only the other day, in attacking a Nonconformist religious journal which had endeavoured to explain the extraordinary difficulties attending the sanitary arrangements of the concentration camps, you said: "The hypocrisy of this defence is more loathsome than the cruelties themselves." If loathsome cruelties have been committed, against whom can this terrible allegation be made? The charge can only apply to the soldiers who have had charge of these camps, and of the transport of the women and children whom their relatives had left behind them on the veldt to starve and die.

In common with others, I have still many relatives fighting in various parts of South Africa. I believe that the opinions they hold represent the universal feelings of the Army in South Africa. Whilst they deeply resent the imputations made upon them, they are unanimous in their declaration and belief that speeches and language such as you have made and used seriously add to their difficulties, and, by encouraging our foes, prolong the war.

You may consider it your political duty to continue this form of oratory, but, if you do, I earnestly hope that for the future you will try to hold the balance a little more evenly between the practices of our enemy and the methods of our countrymen.—Believe me, yours very truly,

George Hamilton.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman addressed the following further letter to Lord George Hamilton:—

Belmont Castle, Meigle, Scotland, Dec. 18, 1901.

Dear Lord George Hamilton,—I have received your letter of yesterday in reply to my invitation that you should make good your words "to the effect that I had defamed and vilified the conduct of our troops in the field."

It is as I knew it would be; you have not a particle of proof to produce. You have made a direct personal charge against me of having with my own mouth maligned our troops in the field, and you can quote no words of mine to that purport; and you pass by as of no account the many occasions on which I have declared my admiration of the kindliness and good temper as well as good discipline of our soldiers.

You offer as an excuse for your unfounded charge two phrases which I have used.

1. In June last I spoke of the war as carried on by "methods of barbarism." This referred to the deliberate policy which seemed to be entered upon of burning houses, deporting women and children and packing them in camps, slaughtering cattle, and destroying stores and other property—these things being done not to punish particular offenders nor to meet some particular military necessity, but as part of a great plan of terrorism and subjugation. What is this but the "method" which barbarism used before the Christian era and which is still employed by some peoples outside the pale of Christendom? But in denouncing this policy as unworthy, and also, in the interest of the future safety of our Empire, grossly unwise, I give no shadow of countenance to any mendacious stories that may have been invented attributing wanton cruelties to British troops.

2. Again, I quoted with disapproval the defence offered for the camps by a certain newspaper which spoke of "our unparalleled humanity" in giving the men fighting against us "relief from their family duties." I am reported as having said that the hypocrisy of such a defence was more loathsome than the cruelties themselves. "Loathsome" is a most accurate adjective to apply to the hypocrisy, and I maintain it. But if my words imply its extension to the cruelties, that was not my intention, for it is not a fitting epithet for them. As you have called me back to the events of last June, let me ask a plain question. Who were right and who were wrong? My friends and I, who condemned the policy, who indicated the evils of the camps, and warned you of their dangers, who suggested alleviations, and who did our best to evoke public interest in the matter, getting ourselves denounced as traitors and Pro-Boers for our pains, or the Government, who joined in the denunciation of us, who refused suggestions, who declared that everything was for the best? Your own statistics which have been published and your own recent action furnish the crushing reply.—Yours very truly,

H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Lord George Hamilton has sent the following reply:—

India Office, Dec. 19.

Dear Sir Henry,—I have to acknowledge your letter, which is only a reiteration of previous denials.

The intention with which you spoke the words I quoted is known only to yourself, their effect is apparent to everyone save yourself.—Believe me, yours truly,

George Hamilton.

The "Manchester Guardian" writes (December 14):—Lord G. Hamilton persists—for that is what it comes to—in circulating the calumny that British troops have been guilty of barbarities in South Africa. It is true that he fathers the calumny on Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, but that does not affect his responsibility. On the contrary, if he had uttered the calumny on his own account it might have passed unnoticed, but when he attributes it, however falsely, to a man so widely and honourably known as the leader of the Liberal party, the matter becomes more serious. In the eyes of foreigners the charge acquires a credibility that it would not otherwise have had, and the feelings of the Boers, if they followed these discussions, would naturally be much more exasperated if it were certified to them on British Ministerial authority that the leader of a party which includes between one-third and one-half of the adult population of these islands held such opinions. But we shall be told that the argument against "encouraging the Boers" does not apply to Ministerial speeches, and that no one in South Africa or in Europe pays attention to what Lord G. Hamilton says. But if his speech was only meant for home reading there was the less reason for him to forget the decencies of political argument. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has challenged him to produce a single passage from his speeches bearing the construction placed on them, and Lord George Hamilton, instead of accepting the challenge, and quoting chapter and verse, merely repeats his original statements which the Liberal leader has already met and denied. The Liberal leader is not a man who uses words and phrases loosely. If he had meant what Lord G. Hamilton says he meant he would have spoken of the

"methods of barbarians." What he did say was "barbarism," and he selected that word to make it quite clear that he was attacking not men but measures, not the execution of it but the system. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has explained this over and over again. Does Lord George Hamilton refuse to believe an assurance so explicit? If so, we shall have to consider our standards of political controversy in England as revised and lowered.

THE PASSING OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

A "GIFT" TO THE NATION.

A very important meeting of the Governors of the Imperial Institute was held, on Saturday, at York House, under the presidency of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. Fifty-two members of the Governing Body were present, including his Royal Highness Prince Christian, the Lord Chancellor, Lord James of Hereford, Lord Kelvin, the Earl of Crewe, Lord Sandhurst, Lord Iveagh, Sir Frederick Abel, Sir Robert Herbert, Sir Owen Tudor Burne, Sir B. C. Browne, Sir William Robinson, Sir Clements R. Markham, Sir Cecil C. Smith, Sir James Peile, General Sir Robert Biddulph, Sir Henry Norman, Sir Charles Elliott, Sir Henry Bliss, Sir Steuart C. Bayley, Sir F. F. Adam, Sir John Wolfe-Barry, Sir David Tennant, Sir Walter Peace, Sir John Evans, Sir C. Lowthian Bell, Sir Raymond West, Sir John Watney, Sir Henry Tyler, the Hon. H. Copeland, and Mr. W. J. Davis, and others.

Lord JAMES OF HEREFORD, as Chairman of the Executive Council, made a full statement of the position of the Institute. He stated that its financial position was most satisfactory, and that its property was worth some half-million of money. He then traced the present policy of the management, which was to improve our commercial action through the Institute's Commercial Intelligence and Scientific Research Departments, but pointed out that the Institute was now acting in directly the same path and the same field as the Board of Trade. The two Bodies had founded similar Advisory Committees, with the same objects and appealing to the same interests. After stating that the original objects of the Institute, especially those connected with the Colonies and India and our other Dependencies, would be completely safeguarded, Lord James suggested that the Imperial Institute, with all its property, should be transferred to the nation.

Resolutions carrying out this view were moved and seconded by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Kelvin, Sir David Tennant (Agent-General for Cape Colony), and the Hon. H. Copeland (Agent-General for New South Wales). Mr. W. J. Davis, President of the Trades Union Congress, also supported the proposition.

After the Resolutions had been carried unanimously, his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales stated that he completely concurred in the proposals contained in them, and announced that the policy of transfer met with the entire approval of his Majesty the King, who was its founder, and had always personally taken a most active share in the management of the Institute.

Commenting on this decision, the "Daily News" wrote (December 23):—It is no doubt very kind of the Executive Council of the Imperial Institute to offer that white elephant to the nation. But we strongly advise the nation to look very closely into the terms of the offer. Lord James of Hereford tried to pass the matter off at Saturday's meeting by the declaration that the property was worth half-a-million. But what is the property? It is a gaudy, pretentious, useless building, very expensive to maintain, situated in the wilds of Kensington, far away from the centre of Government in Whitehall. The nation has just put aside two millions for building a new Board of Trade, a new War Office, and other great structures for Government. Those buildings ought to supply the needs of expansion in the Government departments for many years to come.

The history of the Imperial Institute ought to be a severe lesson to those who wish to lay undue stress on the Imperialistic idea. It is a good instance of the fallacy of size. It was founded in the fever-fit of the first Jubilee, and even Tennyson wrote a very bad poem on it. People imagined that Colonial visitors to London would desert the cosy rooms of the excellent Colonial Institute and would feel much grander if they could stand about in the draughty corridors of an ugly palace. But the Colonists are chilly people, and they still prefer the Colonial Institute. Things went from bad to worse; the Earl's Court Exhibition proved a deadly rival, and now Lord James discovers that its last industry, the work of advice, is much better done by the Board of Trade. The Committee have already handed over a portion to the new London University. The London University succumbed to the high influences brought to bear; and that has been about the last we have heard of the new London University. Is the nation to be the next victim? If so, we hope that the Treasury will have enough courage to take the building down, and make what it can by selling the site and the building materials. It will be an excellent riddance.

The "Standard" said (December 23):—

In order to provide an income the Managers adopted the rather undignified expedient of endeavouring to compete with Exhibitions that frankly catered for the amusements of pleasure-seekers. Residents in the vicinity were invited to subscribe for season tickets, which would provide them with the amenities of an afternoon club and an evening lounge. Bands of music, concerts, tea rooms, and restaurants were to attract the multitudes who had acquired the novel taste for sauntering in the open air. The Institute became rather a pleasant place of resort, where an excellent dinner could be enjoyed, and where an orchestra could play dance music under the glow of coloured lights. But it was never quite clear how all this decorous junketting was calculated to promote Imperial interests, and, after a time, the entertainments were abandoned. The Institute returned to its more serious and legitimate functions. Two years ago the buildings were transferred to the Commissioners of Works as representing the Crown, while the excessive maintenance charges were reduced by handing over a large part of the space to the University of London.

"THE POVERTY OF INDIA."

FROM THE "DAILY NEWS."

Mr. Naoroji's labours on behalf of India richly deserve a permanent record, and this volume, which contains a selection of his writings and speeches during the last quarter of a century, is therefore heartily to be welcomed. It is a storehouse of information for students of Indian economics, and it is something more than that. Mr. Naoroji is an unfaltering friend of England, and he shows his friendship by insisting, in season and out of season, on the high professions and the generous promises which this country has extended to India. The England that Mr. Naoroji admires is the country whose sentiments were clothed in noble language in the Proclamation of 1858, the country of disinterested motives, the champion of liberty and justice, the pioneer of a civilisation which was to unlock the gates of a new era for our Indian fellow-subjects. The England he criticises is the country that has insisted on ruling India as a conqueror instead of a trustee, that has reduced her to bitter and ever increasing poverty by piling burdens on her back grievous and heavy to be borne, and drained away her wealth by the methods of the absentee landlord. These are charges which it is humiliating to read, but no candid student of Mr. Naoroji's writings can avoid the conclusion that Great Britain's professions and performances are, to say the least, very far from coinciding. Mr. Naoroji's complaint that we have not carried out our pledges to admit the Natives to a share in the Government has never received any satisfactory answer, and it seems as if it never will. It is one of the points which the home Government is unable, if it would, to carry in the face of the opposition of the Government of India, with the result that our good name is stultified, and a theory of Empire which deliberately eschews the ideal of active co-operation with the subject races in the work of government has come to hold the field. The reader of Mr. Naoroji's pages will find himself asking again and again whether we have put any serious thought into the problem of governing India. If Mr. Naoroji's faith in Englishmen is not misplaced, it ought to be our aim, one would think, to lead up, step by step, here a little and there a little, to a state of things in whi[illegible] do the greater part of their own governing. Y[illegible]h the people ca[illegible] the course of the last thirty years the mere [illegible]t the fact is that i[illegible]has almost vanished from the minds of poli- idea of such a thing[illegible]bury would be called a Little Englander if his ticians. Lord Salis[illegible] of the seventies were given to the world to- speeches and minutes o[illegible]cy for India. Take one utter- day as the Prime Minister's poli[illegible]oji has collected, his allusion ance out of many which Mr. Naor[illegible]itish territory for the Native to the readiness of Hindus to leave Bri[illegible] the part of the Natives States. "This may be very bad taste o[illegible] but you have to consider what promote[illegible] their tastes, and tends to their moral dev[illegible] way. If you intend to develop their moral [illegible] Anglo-Saxon type, you will make a conspicuou[illegible]sastrous defeat" (? mistake). There is an old-world sou[illegible] already about these maxims that were so obvious only the other day.

We must refer the reader to the strenuous and laborious pages of Mr. Naoroji for the facts and arguments with which the pressing poverty of the Indian people is illustrated and enforced. Mr. Naoroji's principal contribution to this painful question lies in his analysis of the effects of the economic drain of the many millions a year which are levied by this country in one shape and another as tribute upon the Indian people. In the old days, and, for that matter, in some of the Native States to-day, the money raised by the country was spent in the country, and if taxes were high they came back again in one shape and another into the hands of the people. Whether they were higher, as a matter of fact, under the Asiatic régime than under British rule is a matter on which the experts disagree; but there can be no shadow of doubt as to the exhausting effect of a system under which millions of revenue are collected and shipped away without any equivalent. Mr. Naoroji estimates the loss to India under this head at £30,000,000 a year. Whatever the precise figure, it is obvious that a country where the average income per head is between 20s. and 40s., out of which some 5s. goes for taxation, cannot, in the nature of things, bear up against such an ordeal. One conclusion that this book enforces is that in our search for the origin of the chronic famine which has settled down over a large part of the British dominions we must have regard quite as much to the methods by which we are bleeding India as to the vagaries of the monsoon.

POVERTY

AND

UN-BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

BY

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

8vo, PRICE TEN SHILLINGS AND SIX PENCE.

LONDON: SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO. LD.

In India, apply to Mr. D. E. WACHA, 84, Hornby Row, Bombay

WITH SIX PHOTOGRAVURE PORTRAITS AND EIGHT OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS.

Crown 4to, 25/- *net.*

The ORIENTAL CLUB and HANOVER SQUARE.

BY

ALEXANDER F. BAILLIE.

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

LEGAL EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

Full particulars of the course of study and of the cost of living, etc., etc., will be forwarded on the receipt of 8 one anna stamps, by Mr. J. M. PARIKH,

1, CLOISTERS, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

"INDIA," 1902.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

The Annual Subscription to "INDIA," including postage, is Half-a-Guinea (10/6).

Remittances should be sent to the
MANAGER, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for a dozen per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., & 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

"INDIA," 1902.

"INDIA" will b[illegible] forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually recei[illegible]ved at the London office. To this rule there will be no exception.

In order [illegible] obtain every number published during 1902 it is necessary that the [illegible] Subscriber and his Subscription should be received in London before [illegible], 1901, as back numbers will not be stocked. New names will be added as receive[illegible] [illegible]t no back numbers can be obtained.

> *Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?*
>
> *Do you want to see Special Reports of Public Meetings in England concerning India?*
>
> *Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?*
>
> *——— The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.*

The Subscription, including postage direct to the Subscriber, will be at the rate of **Eight Rupees per Annum, Four Rupees Eight Annas per Half Year,** or **Two Rupees Eight Annas per Quarter.**

ORDER FORM FOR USE OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Please fill in this form, and send direct to the London Office with a Post Office Money Order for **Eight Rupees**, made payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL, and crossed ________ & Co.

To the Manager of "*INDIA*," 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Please send me the weekly "*INDIA*" *during* 1902.

Write distinctly.
Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________
____

for which is remitted the sum of Eight Rupees (Rs. 8/-/-).

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.